From: Jay Field
To: Dana Davoli/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA; Robert Neely; Benjamin Shorr
Subject: Re: SCRA vs. QM Data Bases
Date: 12/07/2006 08:36 AM

Dana,
The database will include all non-rejected sample results. Integral provides us with a designation for the preferred result in the database when multiple results exist for the same chemical in a sample. For individual queries, QM selects the "preferred" replicate result for each chemical. Let me know if you need additional information. If you want to check to make sure that this is done correctly, I'd be glad to help you extract the data from QM to confirm.
Jay

Davoli.Dana@epamail.epa.gov wrote:
> How will the QM handle data when we had re-analysis (e.g., for the
> chlorinated pesticides) and when we have multiple results for the same
> chemical in a sample?
>
>
>
> Eric
> Blischke/R10/USE
> PA/US To
> anderson.jim@deq.state.or.us,
> 12/06/2006 04:37 jeff.baker@grandronde.org,
> PM BBarquin@hk-law.com,
> pbattuello@parametrix.com,
> lbernardini@parametrix.com, Curt
> Black/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,
> jeremy_buck@fws.gov, Ben
> Cope/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,
> cunninghame@gorge.net, Dana
> Davoli/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,
> tomd@ctsi.nsn.us, Rene
> Fuentes/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, GAINER
> Tom <GAINER.Tom@deq.state.or.us>,
> rgensemer@parametrix.com,
> Ron.Gouguet@noaa.gov, Joe
> Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Gina
> Grepo-Grove/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,
> howp@critfc.org,
> audiehuber@ctuir.com, Chip
> Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,
> Kristine Koch/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,
> rose@yakama.com,
> erin.madden@gmail.com,
> Robert.Neely@noaa.gov, Sean
> Sheldrake/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Burt
> Shephard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,
> Jennifer L Peterson
> <PETERSON.Jenn@deq.state.or.us>,
> POULSEN Mike
> <POULSEN.Mike@deq.state.or.us>,
> jay.field@noaa.gov,
> jennifer.arthur@EILTD.net,
> chris.thompson@EILTD.net,
> MCCLINCY Matt
> <MCCLINCY.Matt@deq.state.or.us>,
> aron.borok@EILTD.net, Lori
> Cora/R10/USEPA/US, Mark
> Ader/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,
> cinde.donoghue@eiltd.net,
> Benjamin Shorr
> <Benjamin.Shorr@noaa.gov>,
> csmith@parametrix.com
> cc
>
> Subject
> SCRA vs. QM Data Bases
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> As promised, I spoke to Jay Field regarding the differences between the
> SCRA and QM data bases.
>
> The QM data base was developed as a national data base and conforms to
> national rules developed by NOAA, The SCRA data base incorporates site
> specific rules developed by the LWG and in most cases, approved by EPA.
> Overall, the differences in the two data bases are expected to be minor.
> The key differences are the treatment of replicates and the summation
> rules for chemicals such as PAHs.
>
> Regarding replicates, QM treats all lab duplicates, field splits and
> field replicates as individual samples. The SCRA data base averages
> field splits (one sample is homogenized in the field and split into two
> samples) and lab duplicates (one sample is split by the lab into two
> analyses). Field replicates are treated as individual samples in both

> the SCRA and QM data bases.
>
> For non-detect values. NOAA typically excludes non-detect values from
> sums. The SCRA applies rules based on whether the compound is expected
> to be present.
>
> Summation rules may be different. LWG summed chemicals such as PAHs
> according to rules approved for RI/FS. NOAA has own rules that are
> applied for national data base. These rules are applied when data is
> put into QM. We will try to look at the difference that this makes.
> The concept is to take the summed values from the SCRA data base and
> incorporate into QM as a specific record (as opposed to a calculated
> sum). However, this step is not considered time critical for the
> exploratory analysis. However, on a parallel path, Jay will look at
> steps necessary to add summed values as record from SCRA into QM data
> base as its own record. We will begin this process but may not be
> completed in time for pre-Round 2 Data evaluation.
>
> Because differences between the SCRA and QM data bases are expected to
> be minor, for the building the water data base, we will just use the
> SCRA.
>
> See my earlier email that includes the various data reduction and
> summation rules for additional information. Also, please note that
> during the framework discussions, we reached general agreement on the
> application of summation rules. This is described in the October 19,
> 2006 LWG response to the issue summary table.
>
> Jay, please add anything I may have overlooked or misstated.
>
> If you have any questions, please let me or Jay know.
>
> Thanks, Eric
>
>
>

--
Jay Field
Coastal Protection and Restoration Division
Office of Response and Restoration, NOAA
7600 Sand Point Way NE
Seattle, WA 98115-6349
(P) 206-526-6404
(F) 206-526-6865
(E) jay.field@noaa.gov